

**ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES
December 21, 2006
8:30 AM**

The Allen County Council met on Thursday, December 21, 2006 at 8:30 am in the County Council/Commissioners Courtroom. The purpose of the meeting was for additional appropriations and transfer of funds in excess of the current budget. Also, grants and any other business to come before Council.

Attending: Paula S. Hughes, President; Paul G. Moss, Vice President; Cal S. Miller, James M. Ball, Darren E. Vogt and Roy Buskirk.

Also Attending: Lisa Blosser, Auditor; Tera Klutz, Chief Deputy Auditor; Jackie Scheuman, Finance Manager; Becky Butler, Administrative Assistant and Commissioner Nelson Peters.

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 am by President Paula Hughes with the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Cal Miller made a motion to approve the minutes of November 16, 2006. Darren Vogt seconded it. Motion passed 6-0-1(Kite absent).

FINANCIAL REPORT:

Lisa Blosser, Auditor: I have good news to report this morning. We have our 2006 property tax collections all in and our collection rate is 99.47%. That is the highest it has been in four years. As you can see from your financial report, we allowed 3% for uncollected taxes. Because of the higher than anticipated collections, we will roll an additional one million to the 2007 budget. Also, as of November, we have collected 100% of our miscellaneous revenue.

Paula Hughes: That is excellent news. Any questions? Councilman Vogt?

Darren Vogt: I was looking at the General Fund Incentive 4-D and the estimated revenue was \$120,000 and we have collected zero.

Lisa Blosser: We will receive it in December.

Darren Vogt: Okay. I wasn't sure on that.

Paula Hughes: Any further questions?

Cal Miller: Move for approval of financial report.

Darren Vogt: Second.

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second, is there any further discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion has passed 6-0-1 (Kite) Now we are up to Economic Development with consideration of benefits for RJH Park at 10108 Smith Road.

Ashley Steenman: Good morning. I am Ashley Steenman from the Department of Planning. RJH Park, which is also known as Merriweather Tool and Engineering is planning to invest \$4,071,000 to construct a new building adjacent to the Fort Wayne International Airport. The company has been in Fort Wayne since 1990. Merriweather is a small business that currently employs nine people. With this expansion, they will be doubling their workforce by hiring an additional eight workers. They offer a reasonable salary and comprehensive benefits to their employees. I handed out a different handout than what came in your packet. It is an updated points and tax saving projection. In their application, they had initially opted to not contribute 10% to the economic development fund but have since changed their mind. Councilman Buskirk pointed out that if they decided to go with the 10%, that would bump them up to a seven-year abatement and would save them more money as well as put more into the fund. They are eligible for the seven-year abatement and they would save \$76,000. I would be happy to answer any questions. Bob Merriweather is here from the company as well as Allison Best from Revision.

Paula Hughes: Could you ask them to join us please? Welcome. If you could formally introduce yourself for the record, please?

Bob Merriweather: I am Robert L. Merriweather.

Paula Hughes: Tell us about your company.

Bob Merriweather: I do machine and fabrication work and recently got into a little bit of production. That is why I am here because I need more room.

Paula Hughes: How long have you been at the current location?

Bob Merriweather: Since 1992.

Paula Hughes: It looks like a good project. Council any further questions? All right, that was an easy one.

Roy Buskirk: Are we going to do all four of these at once or individually?

Paula Hughes: I thought we would do them individually.

Roy Buskirk: I make a motion that we approve the statement of benefits for RJH Park.

Cal Miller: Second.

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second, is there any further discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion has passed 6-0-1 (Kite)

Ashley Steenman: He is the second one too.

Paula Hughes: Okay. Tell us about GAO Park.

Bob Merriweather: I started that in 1999. I got more of that kind of work and just split it off.

Ashley Steenman: GAO Park is also known as Allen Fabricators. It is a separate building and will be on the southern half of the property. There are twenty employees with an additional twenty to be added. This is the same deal that we had for RJH Park. There would be an abatement for seven years because they opted for the 10%.

James Ball: Do you plan to add those twenty immediately or is this over a period of time?

Bob Merriweather: No, it would be gradual. Right now, the facility we are in, we are definitely squeezing it. We are hoping that once we get the new building, we will be able to add more jobs.

Cal Miller: Mr. Merriweather, what is the difference between the two businesses?

Bob Merriweather: One is a machine shop and the other is a fabrication shop. I started getting more of that kind of work and I realized there was an opportunity and I took it. I had a partner and started that business.

Cal Miller: Were they part of the same business early on?

Bob Merriweather: It was actually one of my customers. I talked him into going into business with me.

Cal Miller: Move for approval for the tax abatement for GAO Park.

Roy Buskirk: Second.

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second, is there any further discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion has passed 6-0-1 (Kite) Thank you. Congratulations on the growth of your business. Next we have a consideration of resolution of statement of benefits for Bailey Enterprises.

Ashley Steenman: Bailey Enterprises is also known as Jerry Bailey Trucking. They have been doing business in Allen County since 1981. Because of increases in demand, they have decided to expand the site on Indianapolis Road. They are investing about \$1.5 million to construct a structure to house the offices, service and storage area. This is a very large investment for a home-grown company. Because of the expansion, they will be hiring an additional six workers. That will be on top of the seventy-four they have already. They are eligible for a seven-year abatement which would save them about \$116,000. As was mentioned in the letter from Todd Churchward, building permits were issued prior to submitting their statement of benefits, therefore they are asking for a waiver of non-compliance. There was some confusion and miscommunication about where the property was and what the abatement was going to be on. Unless you have some questions for me, I will turn it over to Todd Churchward from Baden and Jerry Bailey.

Paula Hughes: Good morning. Could you introduce yourselves for the record?

Todd Churchward: I am Todd Churchward with Baden Tax Management.

Jerry Bailey: I am Jerry Bailey from Bailey Trucking.

Paula Hughes: Welcome. Tell us a little about the project.

Todd Churchward: As Ashley was saying, we have a \$1.5 million dollar investment in new construction. It will replace the current facility that is a double-wide mobile home. We anticipate hiring six new people with an average salary of \$32,500. The company has been in business since 1981 primarily hauling stone, gravel and sand. What else can I tell you?

Cal Miller: Could you flesh out a little more the issue that Ashley brought up about the waiver?

Todd Churchward: Yes. There was some misunderstanding initially between Bailey Trucking and the County as to whether they would qualify for abatement. The question was that the county's initial understanding was that the abatement that they were seeking was for vehicles rather than for the office. When we got involved, we straightened that out but the building permit had been issued. That is why we requested the waiver. The status of the building right now is the footers are in.

Jerry Bailey: Yes, the footers are in and we are working on the plumbing. I think about four to six months ago, my wife called to see what we had to do. Whenever she called, she almost got an answer like we might as well forget it and we didn't have a chance of getting it. We were contacted by Todd and said that we could probably get this accomplished. So we decided to do it. I don't know if this has anything to do with it but I do have to upgrade a county tile on my property at 600 and some feet. That will be at my own expense. I figured why not push this a little bit and see if I can get some tax back here.

Cal Miller: I appreciate the explanation. Ashley, do you know what the mix-up was?

Ashley Steenman: Initially I am not sure who got the call. We thought it was going to be for the trucks. With the nature of the business, mobile vehicles can not be abated by state law. I think that is where things got confused.

Cal Miller: Thanks for the explanation. We need to look into each one so as we are not setting a precedent and giving in on a waiver when there is not a real good justifiable reason. The miscommunication that you identified, Mr. Bailey, certainly satisfies my curiosity and will vote in favor of the waiver.

Paula Hughes: Councilman Buskirk?

Roy Buskirk: I will abstain from the vote because of my relationship with Jerry and Bailey Trucking. Obviously, I do support the passing of this.

Paula Hughes: Councilman Moss?

Paul Moss: There are going to be six new jobs created here. For GAO Park, they were talking about twenty new positions.

Ashley Steenman: Yes.

Paul Moss: Help me understand under Section C of the tax abatement point system, why there is a difference in the local income taxes generated and six positions have a higher point value than twenty positions. Is it because of the number of jobs created and retained? Is it always what is retained or is it what is created?

Ashley Steenman: It is always a combination of both.

Paul Moss: So if an employer has a larger number of employees, they are going to score higher.

Ashley Steenman: Yes.

Cal Miller: A large number of retained employees?

Paula Hughes: A combination of both. Councilman Vogt?

Darren Vogt: There were a couple of different things I was reading through here. The actual construction will be done in 2007, correct?

Jerry Bailey: Correct.

Darren Vogt: And then the overall project will be completed in March of 2008? I was confused about what additional improvements were coming.

Jerry Bailey: That will be the asphalt. By the time we leave everything lay and packed down. As a trucking company, I like to see everything run over first.

Darren Vogt: Okay.

Paula Hughes: Any further questions?

Cal Miller: Move for approval of the waiver for non-compliance.

James Ball: Second.

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second, is there any further discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion has passed 5-0-2 (Buskirk & Kite)

Cal Miller: Move for approval of the resolution for statement of benefits for Bailey Enterprises, LLC.

James Ball: Second.

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second, is there any further discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion has passed 5-0-2 (Buskirk & Kite) Now, we have consideration of a resolution for a statement of benefits for Quik Cut, Inc.

Scott Harrold: Good morning. Scott Harrold from the Department of Planning Services. With me is Mark Webb, the President and Owner of Quik Cut. They are located in Allen Martin Industrial Park which is off Meyer Road south of the old International Harvester. They are investing about \$700,000 in a new laser cutting machine. This will help create four new jobs. This is for a five-year abatement and will save them about \$20,000. With that, I will let Mark explain a little more about the company.

Mark Webb: I am Mark Webb. Quik Cut has been in business since 1997. Three years ago, I bought Bruco Industries that had been in business about twenty-five years. We do steel fabrication and we are job shops. We do specialty work and large items. We don't compete against China just for the mere fact of size. Since I purchased Bruco, sales have almost tripled. With this new piece of equipment I plan adding another 25% growth.

Cal Miller: Could you break that down a little more? When you are talking about fabricating steel, how are those used on an everyday basis?

Mark Webb: We don't design our own parts. We build for a customer. Some of the things we make are barges for construction industry and we make above ground storage tanks. We also do a lot of laser cutting. We make some flanges for a company here in town and those go to Cummins. In 2007, we will be ISO certified. We make anything that needs to be made.

Cal Miller: That is great. Not many of us are familiar with what steel fabrication means. Thanks for the explanation.

Roy Buskirk: My son works for one of your competitors.

Paula Hughes: Council, any further questions?

Darren Vogt: Make a motion for approval of the resolution for statement of benefits for Quik Cut Inc.

Roy Buskirk: I'll second it.

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second, is there any further discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion has passed 6-0-1 (Kite) Thank you and congratulations on the growth of your business. Next up we have a request for appropriation from the Youth Services Per Diem Fund for extra deputy hire.

Chris Dunn: Good morning, I am Chris Dunn from the Youth Services Center. The amount I need to appropriate has been reduced. We are now only requesting \$1,406 to meet the payroll needs through the end of the year.

Paula Hughes: Council any questions?

Cal Miller: Move for approval of item 1.

James Ball: Second.

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second, is there any further discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion has passed 6-0-1 (Kite) Thank you, Mr. Dunn. Next on the agenda is a salary ordinance discussion for the Highway Director. Councilman Moss?

Paul Moss: I don't see any of the commissioners out here. I think one of the commissioners needs to come out here because I have not had an opportunity to talk to them about this.

Paula Hughes: Good morning Commissioner Peters.

Nelson Peters: Good morning. Nelson Peters, Allen County Commissioner. I apologize that I walked into the middle of something and I am not sure what.

Paula Hughes: We are to the salary ordinance request for the Highway Director for 2006 annual salary of \$75,155 and 2007 of \$76,659.

Nelson Peters: That pretty much speaks for itself. Pursuant to the request of this body, we went back and amended our previous vote with respect to Mr. Hartman's appointment as the Highway Director. We voted him as the Director and consequently are asking for back pay.

Paula Hughes: What was the start date of that? When did the commissioners promote him into that position?

Nelson Peters: His official appointment was about September 1st, however, Mr. Hartman had been performing the function of that job prior to January 1, 2006.

Cal Miller: The salary ordinance before us has a request of a retroactive date of September 27, 2006.

Nelson Peters: Okay. I apologize. I have got the sheet that says 2006. If that is the case, then the request is to...

Roy Buskirk: Actually, we have a memorandum from Commissioner Bloom that she was the temporary Highway Director.

Nelson Peters: I am not going to argue the point. If that's what it is, that's what it is.

Cal Miller: I thought the effective date of the salary ordinance was to be retroactive to the first date of employment.

Nelson Peters: Okay and if that was the understanding, that's fine. We will go with that.

Paul Moss: So that number will drop considerably.

Nelson Peters: I am not sure what that number is. All I have is something in front of me that shows the salary for 2006 and 2007. Effectively, what we will do is take the difference between what he was earning and the \$75,155 and pay him that amount back to September 27, 2006. Then we are requesting, going forward, a salary of \$76,659.

Cal Miller: Move for approval of amended salary ordinance for the Director of the Highway Department for 2006 effective date of September 27th for \$75,155 and for 2007 in the amount of \$76,659.

Darren Vogt: Second.

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second, is there any further discussion? Councilman Buskirk?

Roy Buskirk: Have you retained the services of a licensed engineer yet?

Nelson Peters: No.

Roy Buskirk: Thank you.

Paula Hughes: Any further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor, signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign.

Roy Buskirk: One abstention.

Paula Hughes: Oh, okay. Motion passes 5-0-2 (Buskirk & Kite)

Nelson Peters: Thank you.

Cal Miller: Thank you, Commissioner. Appreciate it.

Paula Hughes: Next we have the 2007 budget for the Fort Wayne-Allen County Convention & Tourism Authority. Would you please introduce yourself for the record?

Marvin Krell: I am Marvin Krell, attorney for the Fort Wayne-Allen County Convention & Tourism Authority.

Bob Lister: I am Bob Lister, Director of the Grand Wayne Center.

Marvin Krell: We are here to ask for approval of the budget for the Authority for 2007. We have distributed to each of the Council members the budget data. Bob Lister is here to answer any questions you may have. Following our approval will come Mr. Dan O'Connell and the board member to ask for the approval of their budget for the Convention and Visitors Bureau. If you have any questions, I will try to answer them.

Paula Hughes: Council members?

Darren Vogt: If you could just give us an update on the expansion and projects and how things were supposed to ramp up.

Bob Lister: Sure. Actually, we are going to do an annual report after the first of the year. This will show what we have done and what kind of economic impact we have had. We are kind of the invisible business. We talk about the crowds and how the building eats them up. They go in and sit down in the meeting room and you don't see them. All of the cars are in the parking garage and so you don't see them. This year, we had 43 conventions and that usually versus 25 to 28 in the old building in a normal year. We had 573 events and we thought this was going to be a slow year. About 95% of them are closed to the public so they don't know what is going on down there. This year, we are going to spend some money promoting ourselves and what we do. We started that with the Festival Downtown this year. Since we do very few public events, we are going to try to do more open things so that people can see what we are doing. We had a very good year.

Paula Hughes: Councilman Buskirk?

Roy Buskirk: Do you have any idea on the attendance?

Bob Lister: Probably around 250,000. About half of those come from out of town. Those numbers are just off the top of my head.

Roy Buskirk: I was just trying to get an idea as far as drawing people downtown.

Bob Lister: Certainly. It will vary. There will be weekends where we will have 4,000 people and the Embassy will have 3,000 people and on Thursday night we will dump 7,000 people on downtown Fort Wayne. It is hard to say but there is, at least, a quarter million people that come through our building in a year.

Paul Moss: And how has that increased? Can you trend that over the last few years and tie it to the budget? For 2004 and 2005, what sort of budget did you have?

Bob Lister: It is hard because 2005 budget, we only had seven months to work off of. We didn't have a lot to compare to this year. When we made the 2006 budget, we only had about four months of utilities and that sort of thing. This budget is a lot of educated guesses. In 2007, we now have some experience and we know where we are better on utilities. We worried about 2006 more because it was an estimate of what we do. We are looking at building revenue, which used to be in the \$500,000 range, will almost end up at \$900,000 by the time this year is done. It hasn't doubled yet but I bet in two years it will.

Paul Moss: What is the best measure, in your mind, of performance from an operating perspective? Is it the number of people through the door divided by the operating expense, cost per visitor, what is the best base for this?

Bob Lister: I think everybody could argue different points. The reason we were built is to get people in town that wouldn't normally spend money here. So, is it the number of events? Not necessarily. It is probably the number of events with out-of-town people coming in that stay overnight. We do things like weddings and receptions but that is not the measure of our success. That makes a nice look to the bottom line but our success is measured on the groups that we bring in from out-of-town.

Paul Moss: So since the public spent a substantial amount of money to build the Grand Wayne Center, how has that number changed from the number of people from out of town and how has that changed over time prior to the expansion?

Bob Lister: I think our success will be measured on economic impact numbers. The Convention and Visitors Bureau keeps those and we haven't had a change to look at a full year yet. This is the first full year.

Paul Moss: But you did indicate that you threw out a number that you thought were coming in from out of town...

Bob Lister: 250,000

Paul Moss: Is that for 2006?

Bob Lister: Yes.

Paul Moss: So for years prior, do you have a feel for that?

Bob Lister: 150,000 to 175,000. Maybe at the best year, we did 200,000. You have to really break down those numbers to how many were from out-of-town. But now we are seeing a lot more out-of-town numbers. On a local level, we used to do a lot of weddings and banquets. Since we shut down, a lot of the party halls have now gotten most of the receptions and so forth to go with them. Those affect our bottom line but they are not the reason that we are here. I think when you break it down you need to look at how many are from out of town and how many are spending money. I don't have the number but I am sure Dan (O'Connell) does.

Paul Moss: And you aren't saying that the 250,000 is from out of town. You are saying that it is a total number and a percentage of that is coming from out of town. We don't know what that number is and we don't know from years past. I just want to make sure I understand.

Bob Lister: We did a study in the 1990's as to how much economic impact was coming in.

Paul Moss: That is not what I am trying to figure out. What I am trying to figure out is how many visitors to the Grand Wayne Center have come from out of town.

Bob Lister: Sure.

Paul Moss: But you can't provide that?

Bob Lister: I can but not right off the top of my head.

Paul Moss: Okay. But then going forward, I am curious as to 2007 and what you expect. I am sure you have discussed this at your board meetings and even beyond that. There is a pretty substantial investment in the Grand Wayne Center and I think that one of the things that we have a responsibility to do is to find out what is the best measurement of success.

Bob Lister: I don't think it is bottom line money.

Roy Buskirk: I think that Dan probably has some of the numbers that you are looking for. And the other thing is, you are saying that it isn't the bottom line, it is the bottom line that we are looking for as far as economic development. It is not necessarily the bottom line of the Grand Wayne itself, it is all that is put in the package. That is some of the figures that I mentioned to you in the past. Obviously, 250,000 people is more than the new stadium will draw downtown. The Grand Wayne is already drawing more than what a stadium will draw. The other thing about the Grand Wayne is that it is mostly out-of-town people who are going to be spending money and staying the night.

Bob Lister: When you are coming to the Grand Wayne, you are probably going to be here for a few days. We do have FAME, which is a local attraction but most of what we do are have the attractions where they are going to be spending some nights here.

James Ball: Mr. Lister, just to clarify, on the interest income line, where is that money coming from?

Bob Lister: That is from money in the bank and some things that we have such as CD's, money markets and some safe things.

Cal Miller: How many employees do you have?

Bob Lister: We have twenty-six full-time, probably 200 part-time and that is not counting food service which is about twenty-five full-time and 200 part-time.

Cal Miller: In the salaries and wages in your expenses, how many of the employees are coming out of that?

Bob Lister: About 150.

Cal Miller: Okay. And one big change, that it looks like, is the tournament hosting fee and rebates. That had a zero for 2006 and it looks like you are setting \$85,000 aside for that. What is that?

Bob Lister: That is Dan O'Connell's information.

Cal Miller: Oh, I am sorry. I am on the wrong page.

Paula Hughes: Council any further discussion? Councilman Buskirk?

Roy Buskirk: We were talking about the travel and entertainment number in 2006 was \$27,000 and in the coming budget, it is \$47,000. But that is for Dan again. We can ask Dan.

Paula Hughes: One budget at a time. Any further questions for Mr. Lister or Mr. Krell? Looking for a motion.

Cal Miller: Move for approval of the Grand Wayne budget.

Darren Vogt: Second.

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second, is there any further discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion has passed 6-0-1 (Kite). Mr. O'Connell, please join us.

Laura Rhoades: Good morning. For the record, I am Laura Rhoades and I am the chair of the board for the Convention and Visitors Bureau.

Dan O'Connell: I am Dan O'Connell, the President and CEO of the Convention and Visitors Bureau.

Laura Rhoades: For background, we come before you on an annual basis to let you know that the budget you have before you has been approved by the Tourism Board and the City of Fort Wayne Council. Mr. O'Connell is ready to answer your questions.

Paul Moss: I have a question. On the room tax and sponsors income for 2007, when does that take effect?

Dan O'Connell: If it is successful through legislation, it would take effect in July 2007. Since we have not anticipated that being revenue it is not in this budget. It would be acted upon and approved for 2008.

Paul Moss: The other question I have is with the travel and entertainment. I am curious as to the increase there.

Dan O'Connell: It is higher for two reasons. One is that we are trying to do more traveling to promote ourselves further out. Usually, we do four trade

shows a year in cities like Indianapolis, Chicago and Cincinnati. Next year, we will be doing six including two in Nashville. Two national conventions will be held there. In addition to that, our new sales director feels that it is truly important to cover the regional market well. He has scheduled planning and sales trips, utilizing the sales force in Grand Rapids, Peoria and Dayton.

Cal Miller: What form do these showcases take? What do they do to get people to come to Fort Wayne?

Dan O'Connell: Two of our sales staff will go to Nashville, Indiana and set up a trade show booth in the marketplace hall where up to 150 other cities are exhibiting. They will work as the delegates arrive and go to meetings on professional development. They will also spend time in the marketplace going from destination to destination to find out what we're doing. There are other marketplaces that we will go to that has tables set up and there is a twenty minute interview with us to learn about what is new in the community, hotel inventory and convention space is available. We booked three pieces of business last year at some of those marketplaces. The National Junior Horticulture Association for 2007 will bring 230 people. Also, a Japanese cartoon assembly out of Cincinnati will bring 1800 people.

Cal Miller: So you are tracking your return on investment that way?

Dan O'Connell: We are and for Councilman Moss's question, we can crunch some of those growth patterns over the last couple of years. We can show the delegates that are coming in for conventions here. We do try to keep track of the economic impact for the entire city. We also fill up Spiece Fieldhouse and the Memorial Coliseum. Those are the numbers that we keep track of but we can get down into the Grand Wayne numbers if you want.

Paul Moss: I think we have a duty to do that. I think we should go back a few years and then push it forward.

James Ball: What is your success rate on the retention of these bookings?

Dan O'Connell: That is a good question. Conventions rotate and move around. Once they experience Fort Wayne, we have a good opportunity to get them back. But it is usually three to five years out. We have had a couple of groups that are hesitant to rebook with us because of the condition and inventory of the Holiday Inn. They would like to see better product. It has been a little tougher in the last couple of years to get them to rebook. But there is interest there.

James Ball: Do you have any idea what that retention rate has been?

Dan O'Connell: Until the expansion of the Grand Wayne Center, it wasn't very good. The City and Towns Convention couldn't come back to us until we expanded the Grand Wayne but they are now back on schedule. Our assignment is to find new pieces of business and people who have never been here before. We had the Orthopedic Development and Technology Conference last year and they have rebooked with us.

Cal Miller: The question that I tried to ask Mr. Lister about the new entry for 2007 for the tournament hosting and rebate fees. That represents a substantial increase from nothing to \$85,000. What is that and how do you use that?

Dan O'Connell: That particular line item relates to monies that we plan to collect from the hotel community. They will be assessing a \$5.00 fee for the rooms associated with the American Youth Basketball Tournament and the United States Sport Specialty Basketball Tournament. Two national tournaments, that we were able to bring into the community and it is two of the three national championships that will be held in July. These rebates will be collected by the hotels and put into a pool we manage to help defray the costs for tournament organizers. It will be paid out as referee fees, court rental and much of that money goes back to the high schools for renting the courts.

Cal Miller: I see. So now I see that it is in the revenue section.

Dan O'Connell: It is in the revenue section and it goes back out to the tournament holders.

Cal Miller: Will there be any problem with getting that? It gets charged to the user of the hotel room?

Dan O'Connell: It is called a rebate. It is a situation where if you pay for an \$80 room, the hotel keeps \$75 and \$5 goes to the tournament.

Cal Miller: So the hotel will collect it for you.

Dan O'Connell: Right. And then we keep track of where people stay and how much the hotel pays for the guests that they serviced at that time. We in turn, distribute it back to the tournament at that time. It is common in sports tournaments and marketing because they are often run by volunteers and this helps defray the costs.

Cal Miller: And hotels are interested in doing this because they would be getting folks to spend the night that wouldn't otherwise be there except for the tournament.

Dan O'Connell: Exactly. We have about 75% collection rate. Tournaments are excellent things to get because they will bring upwards of 15,000 people over a three week period in July. They will be using Spiece Fieldhouse as a headquarters but will be using ten other high school and college gymnasiums. They will bring in about \$6,000,000 in July. You will be seeing large colorful shoes, much like you saw with the Mastodons, to help welcome that group to town.

Paula Hughes: Councilman Ball?

James Ball: You had a large decrease in the line item of Research and Studies. Did you do a significant study?

Dan O'Connell: This current year, in cooperation with five other agencies, the Airport Authority, the County, the City of Fort Wayne and the Alliance, coordinated a campaign called the Destination Branding Campaign. We have been working with several agencies so that we had a common way to promote Fort Wayne. We developed a slogan, a campaign and a strategy that all of us could be using and was funded through our organization. That is being rolled out January 10th.

Paula Hughes: Councilman Moss?

Paul Moss: How many employees do you have?

Dan O'Connell: We have ten employees that are full time and two part-time.

Paul Moss: As far as setting wages, I assume that the board sets your wage and that you are delegated to deal with everybody else. We have a conversation coming up here that this may be germane to but is your salary public information?

Dan O'Connell: Yes it is. When requested, we have provided Council with that information.

Paul Moss: Would you be offended if I asked you what your current salary is?

Dan O'Connell: I would not. It would be \$101,000 for 2007. It is a 1% increase over 2006. This is my eighteenth year.

Paul Moss: Thank you. That information is useful.

Paula Hughes: Council members any further questions?

Darren Vogt: Move for approval for the Fort Wayne Allen County Convention and Visitors Bureau budget.

James Ball: Second.

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second, is there any further discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion has passed 7-0. We also have for consideration, a resolution and why don't I let you talk about this.

Dan O'Connell: We thank you many of the Council members that took the time to come to the CVB. We handed out the case booklet and this is the time we feel is the opportunity to appeal to the General Assembly of increasing the hotel and inn keepers' tax from six percent to seven percent and allocating those monies to our organization to improve the promotion and marketing of our city. We have changed considerably since the last time this occurred. The last increase was in 1994. Currently, our promotional budget ranks twelfth in the state. Being the second largest city in the state, we have better assets that can be promoted better. Since the last increase, we have expanded our programming and marketing and we have a larger convention center to fill. We have increased the Coliseum twice in that time. We have new venues that we never had before including the Allen County Genealogical Library which will be a huge asset to promote. Spiece Fieldhouse is becoming a national destination for recreational basketball tournaments. Our board felt that this was the time to appeal to the community and the hotel community supported it with the passage of a resolution and this morning we are asking for the Council's support. Quite often the legislators want to know what the County thinks.

James Ball: By statute, is there any other ways that these monies can be used?

Dan O'Connell: The innkeepers' tax has been in existence since the 1970's and it has been restricted for promotion of convention and tourism development. In forty-eight other counties, it has been for tourism development so I think the answer is that it can only be increased and used for tourism development. We do have other revenues that come into our organization and grants that we have earned, memberships that we sell and advertising. Some communities, like Allen County, use it to help develop the convention center, which is a tourism development tool.

Cal Miller: A couple of questions for you. What percentages of folks that are paying this tax are outside of Allen County?

Dan O'Connell: 100%. This is only an assessment to people who stay in hotels. Virtually all of those people are from outside the county.

Cal Miller: What is the best case you can give us for increasing this tax? How are you going to use that to better the community?

Dan O'Connell: We consider this a user tax that helps us to use the revenues to run the Visitor Center, to get more people back into our community and to help economic development grow. It helps to bring groups here and for us to go out and get them. Next year, we bring in \$11 million dollars in new cases of business.

Cal Miller: One omitted question, you're not concerned that this tax will be a deterrent to people to use Allen County rather than other counties that have lower tax rates?

Dan O'Connell: It was a very sensitive concern to us to not out price us in a tax marketplace. The national average of 13% and we are not exceeding that. We are also below other cities in the state of Indiana. There are cities at 9%, 8% and several are going to 7% with us. South Bend, Evansville and Bloomington are looking to go to 7%. We will not be overpriced in the market.

James Ball: Mr. O'Connell, could you be more specific when you say "go out and get more"? In this budget that we just looked at, you increased the travel and entertainment so that you can attend more shows. If you get this, what are your thoughts specifically?

Dan O'Connell: Specifically, we would like to use \$100,000 to increase electronic promotions. Currently, the size of our budget only allows us newspaper promotions and doing some of the trade shows. We think with internet marketing and new television commercials will help us to compete better in the region. In addition to that, we are hoping to go into some very specialized niche markets where we do very little advertising at all. The new genealogical library is a wonderful opportunity to be the center for genealogical research. We are the largest public library in the nation with that collection. We have an opportunity to attract people to Fort Wayne just to do that research. We plan to advertise in the publications and go to genealogy trade shows. That is where those dollars would go. In addition to that, we have earmarked some of those dollars to bring back the Gold Wing Road Riders. We are currently in negotiations with them but we are

competing with Billings, Montana and Des Moines, Iowa that are putting up incentives. We have to pay for the cost of their parking if they come to us. Since the Coliseum can't discount certain things, we would have to underwrite that. So a portion of almost \$40,000 would be used to pay for the parking. We get a benefit of \$6 million dollars in five days that they are in our community. Finally, there are some niche markets coming on line that want to partner with us for bus tours. We don't do much to get bus tours other than coming to the Lincoln Museum but with the addition of DeBrands and soon the addition of Vera Bradley, those are both private sector businesses, that want to market with us. We have earmarked a plan to put dollars in the niche marketing, electronic marketing and to get some large groups back into the city.

Paula Hughes: I have a resolution if you would like to read it.

Roy Buskirk: Before he does that, have we ever done anything to promote trips from the visiting teams that play the Komets or get bus tours to come with that visiting team? They don't only go to the hockey game but they spend the night, like a weekend travel package. Maybe IPFW and so forth.

Dan O'Connell: There are booster clubs that follow the teams and we haven't really advertised when they come here. What we have done is work with them when they have their All Star games. We advertise the fact that the All Star games are here for both the Wizards and the Komets and when the Fury was here.

Cal Miller: Just so that I know where we are, did we move and approve the budget yet?

Paula Hughes: Yes.

Cal Miller: I make a motion to approve the following resolution.

Whereas, tourism has a \$370 million annual impact on the economy of Fort Wayne and Allen County economy, and

Whereas, over 6,000 full- and part-time jobs are supported by tourism and visitor spending in our community's hotels, restaurants, museums, arts and sporting venues, convention facilities and in the area businesses that support them, and

Whereas, tax revenues from food and beverage sales, hotel stays, ticket sales, car rentals and other sources directly attributable to tourism provide an estimated \$10 million dollars in tax revenues to support local government, and

Whereas, the Fort Wayne/Allen County Convention and Visitors Bureau (CVB) leads our community's efforts to promote our area for tourism, conventions, sports and other gatherings, and

Whereas, the Innkeepers' Tax has not increased since 1994, while the size and number of our visitor attractions has increased dramatically, including expansions of the Memorial Coliseum; the Grand Wayne Center; the Allen County Public Library's Genealogy Department; and the addition of new venues like Jefferson Pointe, Headwaters Park and Spiece Fieldhouse, and

Whereas, the Northeast Indiana Hospitality Association (hotel association), the Chamber of Commerce and the Convention & Tourism Authority support increasing the Innkeepers Room, and

Whereas, the additional funds will be used by the CVB for new branding and marketing promotions to attract more leisure visitors, sports tournaments and meetings into Allen County so that we may enjoy the economic and social benefits of a prosperous tourism industry.

Be It Resolved

The Allen County Council endorses the Bureau's efforts to work with the Indiana General Assembly to increase the Allen County Innkeepers' Tax (IC6-9-9-3) by one percent so that the CVB may undertake new and expanded tourism and convention promotion activities.

Roy Buskirk: I second that.

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second, is there any further discussion?

James Ball: I think it is important to keep in mind that there is an announcement later this morning that could involve an additional hotel you have to balance percentages versus gross dollars. I pause for a moment and look at that we are going to pass this and we are never going to reduce this. As we add rooms and occupancy, these gross dollars are going to continue to rise. My second thought is these are foregoing opportunities. Right now they are going to the Convention and Visitors Bureau but I would like to keep the thought, Mr. O'Connell and no offense to your organization, but there are some other areas that we could be spending the money that would give us more concrete things that we can realize versus a lot of promotion or advertising dollars.

Paul Moss: That is a valid point and I have stated in the past that, when we had the Northeast Indiana Marketing group here, it is a bit of a black hole and it is difficult for me to see tax dollars being spent on marketing. It is a tough line to draw in terms of the Coliseum or the zoo as an example of cross marketing. You are marketing them and they are marketing themselves and

whose responsibility is it to market? This is a substantial amount of money and one of the concerns I have is that we are going to have a form of the Boston Tea Party and these dollars are going to constrict. I don't know when that will be but at some point because there is going to be a limited amount of money. The focus will then turn to infrastructure types of things. I am supportive of this but I think those are very valid concerns.

Paula Hughes: Councilman Vogt?

Darren Vogt: The good thing about this is that they can directly tie their efforts to specific events that come into this community and relate to tax dollars and revenue. They are not as ambiguous as some of the other things that you refer to and I agree that we need to be mindful of the tax dollars and where we put it and how we allocate it. I support this and we need to keep our eye on the ball and getting the most out of our tax dollars.

Paula Hughes: Any further discussion?

Patt Kite: Am I correct in understanding that we are not tied by legislation as to where these dollars are spent?

Dan O'Connell: Actually they are, Councilman Kite. State law restricts the use of the Innkeepers' Tax for convention and tourism development.

Patt Kite: That is vague though. That doesn't equate to promotion.

Paula Hughes: This body approves that budget on an annual basis.

Cal Miller: This is merely an endorsement of the Convention and Visitors Bureau efforts to increase the tax.

Paula Hughes: All right, Councilman Buskirk?

Roy Buskirk: The other thing you need to look at is that the hotels are also supporting the increase in the taxes. They must be seeing an everyday result of this tax or they wouldn't be supporting it. So I call for the question.

Paula Hughes: All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion has passed 7-0. Thank you and good luck. Please let us know if there is any way that we can assist at the legislative level. Council, we now move on to the discussion of the 2007 Sheriff's salary contract. Councilman Vogt, please chair this discussion.

Darren Vogt: As all of you know, for a contract to take place between the Sheriff, the Commissioners and us, we all have to agree on the dollar amount and the principle of the contract. As liaison for the Sheriff, I have been trying to use as much information as I can so we can have a discussion as to what we want to proceed with. I sent to you, a while back, the tax collections, what they have been and what they average for the past six years. Thanks to the Auditor for providing that information. I also gave you the current amount of taxes through November which totaled about \$70,000.

Cal Miller: Again, this is not the tax. It is a portion of the tax that is collected to go towards the compensation of the Sheriff.

Darren Vogt: Correct. That is what money goes into the General Fund when we do have a contract in place.

Cal Miller: Those monies plus the monies that were collected and weren't paid to the Sheriff.

Darren Vogt: Right. No, no, no, no.

Roy Buskirk: The tax goes to the state.

Darren Vogt: Yes. These are just our General Fund dollars. So, just to open this up for discussion, in a public forum, as to what we want to do and how we want to proceed. The issue before us, unfortunately, is a timely one. We have to have this wrapped up by the end of this year. It has put us in a time constraint. I have talked to the Sheriff and he will be around till the end of the year to get this done. From a body standpoint, we may need to have an emergency meeting to get this done or however we need to proceed with that.

Cal Miller: What are the other two pieces of the puzzle saying about they would like to do?

Darren Vogt: The Sheriff-elect has indicated to me that he would be willing to accept the same contract that Sheriff Herman has for \$130,000. I have not spoken with the commissioners regarding that dollar amount yet. Until we have a consensus among us, it is a challenge to try to negotiate something that I don't have the power or authority to do.

Cal Miller: So, in looking at the numbers, Sheriff Herman would have earned at least \$147,000 but actually his longevity pay is greater. He would have earned \$70,000 in 2006 on top of his base pay.

Darren Vogt: Plus December collections.

Cal Miller: Any idea what those historically have been?

Tera Klutz: We have never seen them before.

Darren Vogt: December collections in 2005 were \$1,500. But as I analyzed it, there was no consistent pattern to the dollar amount, when they were collected. There is no pattern whatsoever.

Cal Miller: We need a framework for deciding what we would like to propose as one of the three entities in this equation of deciding whether to enter into a contract. I think we need to be guided by historical figures since the state law still does permit the Sheriff to have a component of his pay being the collection of tax warrant money utilizing the resources of the County. This is a law we should all be actively working to repeal given the windfalls it has created to a County employee in the Sheriff's office for a number of years. Going back as far as 1999 when you look at the documentation that you have provided. I think the second component needs to consider what the demands of the job are and what some other folks in similar jobs like the Prosecutor or the Judges are making. What concerns me is that when you look at historical figures, it looks like you would have to go back to 2003 before the Sheriff's pay would have dipped below \$130,000.

Paula Hughes: That concerns you in what way?

Cal Miller: It concerns me because if this Council were to take the position that the Sheriff should not be paid more than the prosecutor or the judges in Allen County and the Sheriff rejects that notion, then we run the risk of him accepting the way it is now and getting \$150,000 on up or where he might be able to take \$130,000 as Councilman Vogt indicated. History has shown that the pay would be over \$130,000. I would hate to have a greater windfall go to the Sheriff under this situation because of this concern but at the same time I believe \$150,000 is a lot of money in anybody's book and the job of Sheriff does not warrant more pay than the job of Prosecutor or Judge.

Darren Vogt: If you analyze the numbers just based on averages with his current base pay of \$77,000, for a round number, is approximately \$60,000. So if you take the \$77,000 and the \$60,000, the difference is what we would be exposing ourselves to on an average. Obviously the trend on tax collections has been up for the past four years over \$80,000. That would put us at \$20,000 for the current year total. This year's total is a little bit lower than that pending the December collections. We need everyone's input as to what their thought processes are.

James Ball: Has the Sheriff-elect said that he would be at the \$130,000?

Darren Vogt: Correct.

James Ball: We have had no response from the commissioners?

Darren Vogt: I haven't even had a conversation with the Commissioners as to where they would be on that.

Paula Hughes: We have discussed this exhaustively last year and I don't think the conditions have changed dramatically since that time. I have my own reservations about the inequity in pay between the Sheriff, Prosecutor and Judges. I agree with Councilman Miller with the assessment of the equality of those. The bottom line is that this has to be a three-way agreement. We came to conclusion with Sheriff Herman and the reasoning still stands with the next Sheriff.

Darren Vogt: If you recall, we had a thorough analyzation of all Sheriff's pay across the state and I looked for that this morning and could not find it. Some of the 92 counties are on contract and some are on salaries. Some were still taking the tax warrants. That is where we came up with the \$130,000 number along with the tax warrants and what we thought we were giving up. There was some give and take and consideration of other Sheriff's salaries.

Paula Hughes: Councilman Buskirk?

Roy Buskirk: I guess we should learn that a good time to negotiate the contract is during the campaign season. The other thing is that there is legislation coming forward this year, sponsored by Marion County, putting the Sheriff's wages at a fixed amount. It has been suggested that the Prosecuting Attorney's will also. We need to keep this in the back of our minds.

Paula Hughes: Isn't this an annual contract?

Cal Miller: Yes.

Paula Hughes: Councilman Miller?

Cal Miller: The landscape has changed to a degree that is worth mentioning. When we were negotiating with Sheriff Herman, the two prior years to 2005, had been astronomical with \$174,000 and \$210,000 being paid to a county employee. 2005 dipped down to \$150,000 and 2006 would have been about the same for Sheriff Herman. What we need to recognize is that if we are talking about negotiation using factors as what is the upside for Sheriff-elect and what is the downside for the County, then we have to consider that the

downside would be that if we don't enter into a contract for the \$130,000 and the Sheriff was to make \$160,000 or \$170,000, then that would be the downside to the County. But the downside to the Sheriff in this scenario, since we are seeing a downward trend from the \$210,000, is that if these collections don't continue at that rate, the Sheriff-elect would be making \$76,000. So there is downside. It could be looked at as a \$50,000 swing the Sheriff's way.

Paula Hughes: It is not that big of a swing because even the most minimal year is \$26,000. It would still be over \$100,000.

Cal Miller: All right. So the downside, I don't know what the average is...

Darren Vogt: The average is \$36,000 for 1993 to 2005.

Cal Miller: So that would put the Sheriff-elect at \$110,000 and the downside for him would be about a \$20,000 downward swing. But the upside for us is that it could be \$150,000 or \$170,000. When you do that math, I agree, it makes a lot of sense. I still can't go for \$130,000.

Paula Hughes: This is a three-way negotiation. The Sheriff-elect has said that he would sign a contract for \$130,000 but that he would not for \$115,000. If all three parties do not sign the contract, then it falls back on what is in statute.

Cal Miller: I am aware of that.

James Ball: In my mind, there is a lot of merit given to that he is running the largest dollar department. To me, it gives a lot of credibility to the wage.

Patt Kite: He is probably also responsible for more employees than anyone else. A lot of umbrella of what the Prosecutor and Judges do eventually ends up in the Sheriff's lap. If the Council was happy with the \$130,000 figure last year, I don't know why it would be an issue to change it this year. It is an annual contract and we are looking at possible legislation that will limit what we are able to do next year.

Cal Miller: The only retort I would have for you, Councilman Kite, is that the trend creates less fear in me than it did when Sheriff Herman was already at \$170,000. He was negotiating from that position. That trend has appeared to change although still supporting arguments for \$130,000 pay. From 2004 to 2005, it went down \$60,000 and Sheriff Herman already had that in his back pocket.

Patt Kite: But we can't predict what that trend will be. Collections for next year may be astronomical.

James Ball: I would also say on the flip side that it is relative to Sheriff Fries. I am sure that he is going to recognize if his collections coupled with his average salary, I am sure the discussion will be approached again next year and he will be very aware of the collection dollars.

Paula Hughes: Councilman Buskirk?

Roy Buskirk: Another reason for the downward trend might be because of the Governor's amnesty program a year ago.

Paula Hughes: That was 2004.

Darren Vogt: 2005.

Paula Hughes: Was it 2005?

Roy Buskirk: Yes, 2005.

Paula Hughes: Announced in 2004 and ended in 2005?

Roy Buskirk: Correct.

Paula Hughes: There was a pretty good upswing in 2003 too. Council I would be supportive of the \$130,000.

Darren Vogt: I don't know if we need a motion or a straw poll or what.

Paula Hughes: I think we move to approve a contract.

Darren Vogt: But we don't have a contract to approve. That is the problem.

Lisa Blosser: We can do it through a salary ordinance.

Jackie Scheuman: We have to do a salary ordinance before the end of the year.

Darren Vogt: So all we would need is the salary ordinance at \$130,000.

Paula Hughes: The entire Council doesn't need to sign the contract, do they?

Tera Klutz: You can if you want to.

Paula Hughes: We can just authorize the President to sign the contract?

Roy Buskirk: We can go ahead and pass this and if they don't agree to it, we will have to have an emergency meeting or something.

Tera Klutz: If they don't approve the contract, he could get \$130,000 and tax funds.

Roy Buskirk: I realize that but what if they approve some different figure?

Darren Vogt: Can we approve a salary ordinance pending a contract or not?

Jackie Scheuman: That is what you did last year.

Darren Vogt: That's what I thought.

Cal Miller: Do the salary ordinance contingent on a contract. Otherwise it is his base pay and longevity.

Roy Buskirk: To keep it moving forward, I make a recommendation for a salary ordinance at \$130,000.

Paul Moss: Second.

Paula Hughes: **We have a motion and a second.** Councilman Miller?

Cal Miller: I think the motion or I would request that the motion include the contingency that the salary is for \$130,000 contingent upon a contract entered into by the Sheriff, County Council and the Commissioners approving a \$130,000 pay. If that contract is not entered into by the end of the year, the salary ordinance would be his current base pay plus longevity.

Roy Buskirk: That is exactly what I said.

Paula Hughes: Councilman Buskirk has amended his motion.

Paul Moss: And I amended my second.

Paula Hughes: **We have an amended motion and an amended second. Any further discussion?**

Paul Moss: I would just say that the way I look at this, is that I do not share the view that the Prosecutor and Judges are equal. I think this position is one of several unique positions in the County and I do look at it in the terms of

the number of employees, the number of times the Sheriff is named in a lawsuit and a variety of factors. I don't think that \$130,000 is an unreasonable salary. I do think that the Convention and Visitors Bureau, although not under our control, is a relevant measure when you are talking about ten employees and \$101,000 a year. There are lots of cases of that out there.

Cal Miller: It is an important job. No question about it. My questions have nothing to do with the talents of Sheriff-elect Fries and the staff that he has assembled. I think the whole process and the way it is written is just wrong. No public official should be benefiting by utilizing taxpayer dollars to line their own pocket. It is just flat out wrong. It causes me a great deal of consternation about the way the law is set up. There is no risk associated and is utilizing taxpayer dollars to profit a single person or position in Allen County. I find that to be unacceptable. We need to stay in line to get that law changed and then end up paying the Sheriff commensurate with the job that he does.

Paul Moss: I don't disagree with you there. By setting a salary and looking at it again and more objectively and perspective by forgetting about prior years, just look at the job, I would say the same thing. The \$130,000 is a reasonable amount.

Cal Miller: I intend to support the motion because I think the numbers support the \$130,000 despite my misgivings about why we are in this position in the first place.

Paula Hughes: Councilman Vogt?

Darren Vogt: I will make this brief. We have put this as a high priority on our legislative agenda and we need to continue to find someone who is willing to carry that legislation from our own delegation. With that, I will call for the question.

Paula Hughes: All those in favor please signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion has passed 7-0. Moving to the addendum of our agenda, we have five salary ordinances to consider. First, the Prosecutor's office is requesting a salary ordinance for the Administrative Director, Civil Division.

Mike McAlexander: Hi, I am Mike McAlexander, Chief Deputy Prosecutor and this is Susan Tate, our Chief Deputy of Operations. We are here about a position that went before the Personnel Committee last week and this particular position supervises forty-five people. In the study that was recently

done could take this up to a SAM 6. To bring this in line with other positions of similar responsibilities, we ask that you approve this. The Personnel Committee request forms have been attached and pretty well explain the basis behind it. The Personnel Committee has added a few items that this particular position is not only important in our office but is also the leader at the state level in the Indiana State Child Support Alliance and also serves on a national committee.

Paula Hughes: Council any questions? The Personnel Committee did approve this request. Councilman Vogt?

Darren Vogt: This is a reclassification, correct?

Mike McAlexander: Right.

Darren Vogt: Unfortunately, I was not at that meeting and I am going to make a blanket statement to pretty much all of these reclassifications. I have grave concerns that we pull out specific positions, albeit maybe warranted, this further creates inequities for the positions that have not been evaluated and I am not sure that when we go through and individually pick and pull ones apart that we are not doing a further injustice. If we do it this way, we are going to have more and more of these come through on an individual basis.

Mike McAlexander: In answer to that, we started the process on this before the study began and it has been one where we have been told that we should wait until the study is done and it actually does have a different classification than what we received from the study. It was moved up in the study with these other positions in our office. It has been in the hopper for a considerable amount of time. We have many changes pursuant to the study and I think several other departments are in the same boat. We have not asked to have all of those other changes to be implemented at this time.

Darren Vogt: You are one department of many others. That is my concern.

Paul Moss: We talked about this at the Personnel Committee. We relied on our Human Resources Director to filter these requests based on urgency of need. I understand what you are saying but I think it is unfair of us to continue to tie peoples' hands based on the fact that the salary study is woefully overdue. There is no real harm in going forward with this one. Don't assume that it is going to change because of the salary study. That is a risk that I am personally willing to take. They are trying to correct an inequity that is currently there. It is imperfect but there is no way around it. Hopefully, the salary study is going to get done here soon.

Patt Kite: I still have concerns that this has been in the hopper and there have been lots and lots of classifications that have been in the hopper for a long time and I am just a little skeptical that we may create greater inequities along the way, by approving this one.

Paul Moss: I don't think we are creating greater inequities. I think the inequity is that we are doing this for them and not another department. That is where we have to rely on the opinion of our Human Resources department to filter some of these. We have been sitting for a year.

Darren Vogt: Two years, October 2004.

Roy Buskirk: I think there is one inequity in the fact that this position has not been increased and the others in your office have been. This was made during their presentation before the Personnel Committee. This is one of the things that we are hoping this study does is eliminate some of the inequities. Same work, same pay and this is one of the reasons I supported this at the Personnel Committee.

James Ball: I make a motion to approve the salary ordinance for the Prosecutor's Office for a PAT 6 with an annual salary of \$56,809.

Paul Moss: Second.

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second, is there any further discussion? Do we need to read the formal salary ordinance or does this include enough of the language?

Cal Miller: The salary ordinance is PAT 6/6 with an annual salary of \$56, 809 for the Administrative Director of the Civil Division.

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second, all in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion has passed 7-0.

Darren Vogt: You didn't get a vote out of me.

Paula Hughes: You need to say something.

Cal Miller: You didn't say no.

Paula Hughes: So let's redo the vote with a hand count please. All those in favor please signify by raising your hand. All opposed same sign. The motion passes 6-1 (Vogt).

Patt Kite: Can I just ask a question? Would it be possible for members who are not on the Personnel Committee to have some kind of report from the Personnel Committee?

Lisa Blosser: It should come from the HR Department.

Roy Buskirk: Prior to the meeting? Is that what you are wanting?

Cal Miller: No, at the conclusion.

Patt Kite: So that the rest of us are privy as to what you discuss.

Paul Moss: I can give you a report real quick. We basically approved moving these forward to this body. And I will say that it is little frustrating because we went through this with the Highway Director position. The Personnel Committee met, made the decision and when it came out here, it blew up. One of the questions I have going forward is are the Personnel Committee recommendations good enough or do we need to reorganize that a little bit?

Patt Kite: What are they based on? Apparently this was something that had been established before and that is what I would like to be privy to.

Paula Hughes: Councilman Buskirk and then Miller?

Roy Buskirk: This is one reason why the comments on my decision and why the reason was and I anticipate on each of these other ones to be injected with what my opinion was and my decision on the Personnel Committee was.

Patt Kite: I appreciate that.

Roy Buskirk: Some of these were passed out of the Personnel Committee just to bring them forward to the full Council for discussion. Not necessarily that the Committee approves them.

Patt Kite: Your comments are what actually clarified things for me. But it would be nice to have a little heads-up.

Paul Moss: You are correct that a report or formal reporting for it would be ideal and the individual that should be providing that report is not here.

Paula Hughes: Councilman Miller?

Cal Miller: I withdraw my request for a question.

Darren Vogt: And to that point, if I felt I had further clarification from the HR Director, I would be able to support these. But knowing what I know and I apologize for not being there for the discussion, but I am going to be consistent through all of these. As a general philosophy, I am sticking where I am at on these.

Paula Hughes: Council we are moving forward with discussing a salary ordinance for the Finance Administrator in the Juvenile Center. Request is for a PAT 5 with annual salary of \$48,895.

Joe Brita: Good morning Council, I am Joe Brita from the Allen County Juvenile Center. I am requesting approval on this salary ordinance for the Finance Administrator position. This is in lieu of an Executive Secretary position which will be eliminated. This will have no fiscal impact on County General because we will absorb the difference in pay. This will allow us to put all financial responsibilities under one hat. Our department has grown tremendously and with a \$9 million budget, it is simply too much for one person to handle. Since 2001, I have handled the budget and we started to put the pieces together in June or July and it has worked out marvelously.

Paula Hughes: Councilman Vogt?

Darren Vogt: What was used to determine the PAT 5 level?

Joe Brita: There are other financial administrators in the County. We used that same job description but I don't know if they have as many employees as we do.

Cal Miller: Who established the PAT 5?

Joe Brita: I don't understand.

Cal Miller: Is that something that goes through the Human Resources Department to assign that?

Joe Brita: Yes.

Darren Vogt: Does Human Resources assign the PAT 5 or do you?

Joe Brita: We consulted with the Human Resources Department.

Paul Moss: It went through the standard process of assignment.

Roy Buskirk: I am sorry for butting in here but you discussed this with the Human Resource Director and came up with PAT 5/4. I don't understand why there are two numbers involved.

Paula Hughes: The second is their step within the position.

Joe Brita: Councilman Vogt, this was re-evaluated by the Temple Group. I can quite equate the numbers to the SAM category (inaudible)

Darren Vogt: I appreciate that but we haven't implemented the SAM grid. My concern is that we have other Financial Administrators and they are not paid consistently across the board. That is the question I was asking you if they are all paid the same and the answer is that they are not. Again, that is further concern I have across the County.

Paul Moss: If you look at the job, there are several other Financial Administrators out there and this would be consistent with those.

Darren Vogt: The Sheriff's is a PAT 4 or a 3.

Lisa Blosser: I went back after the meeting and looked some of the classifications up. I think this is the right classification, but the Sheriff and Community Corrections Controllers are not PAT 5's.

Paul Moss: That was not the impression that I had in the meeting.

Paula Hughes: That they were all close.

Lisa Blosser: Yes, that is what he said. I think you should probably move ahead with this. But you need to address the Sheriff's office and Community Corrections or you will have more inequities.

Paul Moss: I am not sure.

Lisa Blosser: They also have huge budgets and are doing the same work, large staffs and lots of grants to administer. They are very similar financial positions.

Roy Buskirk: I am not sure they should be a five.

Paul Moss: Well, they may be, I don't know. Given this new information, I have to say Darren's point is very valid. We are going to now create further inequities with the other Finance Administrators until this salary issue is

resolved. That is frustrating. I asked directly and was given wrong information.

Cal Miller: So the Personnel Committee's passage of this out to Council was in error. The similar situated Finance Administrators were PAT 5?

Paul Moss: That is correct. I would say that was not the sole basis but was part of the basis. Essentially, she is doing the work and was appointed to that position and it appears that it is the appropriate adjustment to her title and to reflect the job duties that she is doing. But the question that was asked is if this PAT 5 is similar to all of the other Finance Administrators and the answer was yes.

Cal Miller: Can we get clarification on this from Mr. Dumford and table this until the first meeting in January so that we are not creating the inequities that are being expressed here?

Roy Buskirk: The other ones are PAT 4?

Lisa Blosser: No, they are either a PAT 3, 4 or 5. The job description that he looked at was for the Board of Health. They are similar positions.

Paul Moss: It appears that they should be PAT 5.

Lisa Blosser: I think they all should be.

Paul Moss: If we do this, we are creating inequities with the others which frankly, I could live with that. We need to move this forward and not continue to tie their hands. We would have to deal with it at some point anyway.

Cal Miller: So the Department of Health has a PAT 5.

Lisa Blosser: Right.

Darren Vogt: And the Sheriff has a 4 or 3 and puts our study further with Sheriff Fries coming forward and saying that we did it for this one why not his. That is the concern that I have. We haven't been consistent in how we are approaching this. I know that as the Personnel Committee, we asked Mr. Dumford to bring the ones before us that seem to be justified. I am not sure that without looking at it, this may be justified. I am looking that we be consistent in how we treat everyone until this study is complete. We are going to have an onslaught of people who are going to come before us and ask to have their reclass now.

James Ball: I would state that it is a fair expectation considering that it has been two years. The looming question is where is this study at and how much longer do we keep saying that we need to wait?

Roy Buskirk: Can I make a suggestion? What is a PAT 4, Jackie? What would a PAT 4 Step 4 pay?

Lisa Blosser: We don't have the grids with us.

Roy Buskirk: Would it be wrong, because this individual is doing the Financial Administrator's work and it would be an advancement for her, to go to a PAT 4 Step 4 pay until we get the study back?

Paula Hughes: That seems fairly arbitrary.

Paul Moss: I do think that then you just kind of compound the issue. This went through basically the same process that everybody else is going through. It was identified as a PAT 5. I think this is somewhat analogous in terms of how this will create additional inequities. It is similar to additional raises. I think that creates additional inequities. I am probably alone in this argument. We are close to the end, I believe. Members of the Personnel Committee have been communicating with Mr. Temple several times a week now for the past month to try to keep this thing moving forward. I am comfortable with moving this forward.

Patt Kite: Can we set a deadline?

Paula Hughes: We have set deadlines.

Roy Buskirk: I had a telephone conversation with Mr. Temple Tuesday morning and he has finally received the additional information that he needed from our Human Resources Department and is going through with it. There are steps and deadlines that we have set with him and he feels that he would be able to stay on that.

Patt Kite: Did he give you a ballpark completion date?

Roy Buskirk: What is it, a couple of months or something?

Darren Vogt: Thirty business days from receipt of the information that he needed from the HR Department.

Roy Buskirk: And then you have to implement it so it is not done when he gets the study done.

Patt Kite: I understand that but when he is done...

Paula Hughes: Councilman Miller?

Cal Miller: There have been some discussions about creating inequities, which are valid concerns, but the greater inequity in this is that the Juvenile Justice Center, out of necessity, needed to create a position. This position was to handle all of the different funding streams that they have and that is a big budget. They let us know that they were creating this position and she continued to get paid at the lower rate but they had to do it out of necessity. The greater inequity is to continue to pay her at the rate that doesn't have anything to do with the position that she is in. I am willing to move forward at the proposed rate. We will deal with the inequities when we are finally at the end of this process.

Paula Hughes: Is that a motion?

Cal Miller: Yes, I move to approve the salary ordinance for the PAT 5/4 Finance Administrator with an annual salary of \$48,895.

Paul Moss: Second.

Lisa Blosser: This is two separate positions. You are zeroing...

Cal Miller: I am zeroing out the Executive Secretary position and move to approve the zeroing out of that position.

Paul Moss: Second again.

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second, is there any further discussion?

Patt Kite: Just one question. Did you say that this would not impact the General Fund?

Joe Brita: I will absorb (inaudible).

Darren Vogt: For 2007 but will go in for 2008.

Joe Brita: The Judge sat here and in front of Personnel Committee and said that we would reduce our budget next year by this amount.

Paula Hughes: Okay.

Roy Buskirk: We have two different numbers.

Lisa Blosser: There are two different positions.

Paula Hughes: Does it need to be two separate motions?

Lisa Blosser: It is all one ordinance. When you say “in lieu of”, the Executive Secretary is zeroed out.

Roy Buskirk: I call for the question.

Paula Hughes: All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion has passed 6-1 (Vogt). The Sheriff’s Department is requesting a salary ordinance for two registered nurses. These are requested to be PAT 4 with annual salaries of \$40,351.

Ken Fries: Good morning.

Paula Hughes: Good morning, could you introduce yourselves for the record please?

Ken Fries: Ken Fries, Sheriff-elect of Allen County.

Vanessa Miller: Vanessa Miller, HR Coordinator for the Sheriff’s Department. We have been to the Personnel Committee and two of our line items are RN’s for the Allen County Jail. They were currently put in as PAT 3 for 2007 but have been approved moving it to PAT4 which makes it in line with the Allen County Juvenile Center. This gives an annual salary of \$40,351.

Paul Moss: Can you refresh my memory? You are replacing a couple of QMA’s?

Vanessa Miller: The split off is three QMA’s for two RN’s. We have three QMA line items that are currently vacant. We are willing to zero out the QMA’s for the RN’s.

Paul Moss: So it is revenue neutral. One of the reasons I support this is that over the past couple of years, I have come to understand some of the challenges that you are faced with and it could really shift dramatically over the next year if not sooner. You may have difficulty finding and recruiting nurses at this salary rate but I think this is the appropriate way to go. There

are a lot of dynamics as to what the nurses will be able to do. I certainly support this as part of a restructuring of that service that you provide.

Roy Buskirk: It will be budget neutral for the next four years, right?

Vanessa Miller: Yes. No.

Cal Miller: One of the conversations we had with Sheriff Herman was the possibility, given the concerns of rising health costs, of the jail hiring a physician as a point person. I know Johnson County does that as a way to control their costs. Do you have something like that on your agenda?

Ken Fries: Yes. I think with everything that we have seen with the RFP's, it is going to wind up being the most cost effective way rather than privatizing the nursing staff. But I am going to look at both options and see what kinds of prices they come back with. I have spoken with Sheriffs from other counties and they were amazed that we keep our costs down as much as we did. I think the doctor option is going to be pretty viable.

Cal Miller: It is my understanding that those positions can maintain some semblance of a private practice but yet serve with sufficient frequency to meet the needs of the inmates. I am glad to hear that you are pursuing that.

James Ball: Make a motion to approve the salary ordinance for the PAT 4/2's for the Registered Nurses with an annual salary of \$40,351 in lieu of zeroing out the three QMA's.

Paul Moss: Second.

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second, is there any further discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion has passed 7-0. What happened that you changed and voted?

Darren Vogt: Completely different scenario.

Cal Miller: Thank you Sheriff-elect.

Paula Hughes: The Circuit Court is requesting a salary ordinance for two Administrative Assistants. One is OSS 4 with annual salary of \$27,477 and the other is OSS 4 with annual salary of \$30,005. Mr. Miller, please introduce yourself for the record.

Tim Miller: Tim Miller, Allen Circuit Court Administrator. I took an opportunity of a vacancy. Through attrition, we had a full-time position go to

part-time and during this whole evaluation process, we have been looking at this for two years. I reduced a Judicial Assistant to a Court Reporter which gave us some dollars and then I had two file clerks that I have been trying to move to Administrative Assistants. This is based on their workload and some other things that they absorbed from those downgraded positions. Budget neutral and it is file clerks moving to Administrative Assistants. It goes from PAT 3 to PAT 4.

Paula Hughes: Council any questions?

Darren Vogt: So you are re-evaluating the position completely?

Tim Miller: Yes. I made certain assumptions that the job evaluations would pick that out eventually. This job has been evaluated at that.

Paul Moss: I can't recall why the HR Director let this one through.

Tim Miller: I can address that. I had someone hired into this position and she left because the position was rated into that at the time. It is now an open position. The amount of work that she had to do and with her previous experience, she had a better offer somewhere else and she took it. I lost training time and everything else because I thought this was pretty much a no-brainer based on the analysis. That is why you pay me \$72,000 a year to make those decisions.

Paul Moss: How much?

Tim Miller: It is a matter of public record. Essentially I have tried to work through the system but it has been going on for two years and what else is there to say?

Paul Moss: I move for approval of the salary ordinance for the OSS 4/1 with an annual salary of \$27,477 as well as OSS 4/3 with annual salary of \$30,005.

James Ball: Second.

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second, is there any further discussion?

Roy Buskirk: We haven't voted any of these down yet, have we?

Paula Hughes: No.

Lisa Blosser: No.

Paula Hughes: Hearing none, all those in favor please signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion has passed 7-0. Thank you very much. The Allen County Assessor is requesting a salary ordinance for an Extra Deputy Hire. This is a part-time position with a pay range of \$10-35 per hour. I do not see anybody in the audience.

Lisa Blosser: We said that we would present it for her, if that is okay. Stacey wasn't able to attend today. She is just increasing her Extra Deputy Hire pay range. She needs to bring in some help at the first of the year to finish our trending.

Paul Moss: This is not the Market Analyst position.

Lisa Blosser: No.

Paul Moss: So this is not something that was talked about in the Personnel Committee?

Lisa Blosser: It is just a change for the Extra Deputy Hire. Right now, I think the max is at \$15 an hour.

Roy Buskirk: Did they pull that?

Darren Vogt: It doesn't come before the Personnel Committee.

Lisa Blosser: No, it is just part of the annual budget process and it is a range. She may not even pay up to that high, it is just a pay range.

Roy Buskirk: No, no. no. I mean what she brought before Personnel Committee.

Lisa Blosser: The Market Analyst hasn't been through Temple's process yet.

Roy Buskirk: Okay. I wondered if she pulled it. Now I understand. I make a motion that we increase the Extra Deputy Hire to \$10-35.

Darren Vogt: Second.

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second, is there any further discussion?

Cal Miller: I think there should at least be a comment that the \$35 per hour is a pretty hefty rate but since what she is seeking is assistance in trending,

the contract employee that she is getting will have significant experience. Based on that understanding, I am in support of the salary ordinance.

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second, is there any further discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion has passed 7-0. One last bit of business before the Council is that we have four appointments that are expiring at the end of 2006. I should have brought this to your attention last month but I didn't. We have an annual appointment to the Alcohol Beverage Commission, Gerald Neu. We have a four year term which is expiring for Jim Williams on the Library Board. An annual appointment, of Jesse Rios to the Allen County Child Care Facilities Board and annual appointments to the PTABOA Board with Stacey Lopshire and Judy Macon. I believe the sitting Assessor cannot fulfill that position but I will check on that. There is an annual appointment to the Woodburn Economic Development Commission of Clarence Reichert. I will invite all of these individuals to our organization meeting on January 4, 2007. I will see if they want to continue in those positions. If you have nominations in mind, be prepared to bring those forth at that meeting.

Roy Buskirk: Is that at 8:30? This is the first I have heard of it.

Paula Hughes: Yes, 8:30 on the 4th. Is there any other business to come before the Council? Councilman Vogt and then Buskirk?

Darren Vogt: Council, we have been dealing with this reclassification since October 2004. We decided this year to pass a two percent increase to the employees. With that being done, and we are close to the end of the data gathering phase of the study but we are not close to the implementation phase. Knowing how we have been moving on that, I have concerns and I would like to see us add an additional one percent to our increase in salary. I talked to Commissioner Peters this morning and I don't know what index he used but it was 3.5%. I don't feel that we are going to get anywhere in 2007. I want to compliment Councilman Ball on his idea of getting to a merit bonus system to allow the performance based type of environment to reward employees. With that, I would make a motion that we add an additional one percent to our salary line item which is approximately \$400,000. And we did collect an additional \$1 million dollars in revenue this year.

Paula Hughes: Add one percent to all of the employees' salaries?

Darren Vogt: Correct.

James Ball: I would interject, and if I remember correctly, what were the previous two years?

Lisa Blosser: In 2003, there was zero percent increase and in 2004 there was zero percent. In 2005, there was three percent and 2006 two percent.

Roy Buskirk: No, no, no, no.

Paula Hughes: Those don't seem like the accurate figures. We have not gone...

Lisa Blosser: For the past four years, since you have been on Council. In 2003, it was zero. Then, in 2004, we had to make all of those cuts and it was zero. And in 2005, it was three percent and 2006 was two percent.

Roy Buskirk: But they also received their step increases.

Lisa Blosser: Not everyone. Not everyone is on a grid. We are talking about a cost of living adjustment.

Cal Miller: I would have started at 2000 was ten percent. In 2002 it was three percent. There were two years where there was no increase.

James Ball: I guess with the information that Ms. Blosser gave us this morning of the additional one million, I think sharing 60% of that would not be unreasonable.

Patt Kite: Forty percent.

James Ball: I would support a 1.5% increase. That would be 60%.

Patt Kite: That might bring us closer to what we are going to be facing anyway.

James Ball: I think it is only fair to share...

Roy Buskirk: There will be some redlined though on that study.

Patt Kite: I understand that.

Cal Miller: I am a little taken back by the surprise by a motion being made at the tail end of this meeting at the tail end of the year because there are more ramifications. The analysis that we undertook to arrive at the two percent was multifaceted. It didn't have to do with whether we had an additional million or not. It was much more in depth than that. While I am happy to undertake the analysis, this doesn't provide us to do our job by looking at all

of the factors to make an increase in pay. We are not doing our job if we sit here and in a vacuum increase the salaries by one or one and a half percent. I am happy to roll up my sleeves and tackle this problem with all of the factors but I am not going to make a knee-jerk reaction that is permanent. It is an increase that not only affects 2007 but all other years. For those reasons, I can't support the current motion.

Paul Moss: Is there a second?

Paula Hughes: No there is not. Councilman Vogt?

Roy Buskirk: There are two motions.

Darren Vogt: Councilman Miller...

Paula Hughes: Both have died for lack of second.

Darren Vogt: To your point, I agree with you. The problem is there isn't going to be any change in 2007. I don't see anything happening in 2007. That is the main reason, the one million dollars has nothing to do with my motion.

Paula Hughes: We have another year without having a resolution to this?

Darren Vogt: No, the implementation of it will not be until 2008. That is my prediction. It has taken us two years and two months to get to where we are now and this is going to be a major implementation process. If we don't get results until February, at the earliest, we will talk about another six or seven months of discussing how to implement the process that is equitable and we can afford to do. By delaying, we are still not rewarding our employees with current trending and dollars and they continue to fall behind.

Paula Hughes: Councilman Buskirk?

Roy Buskirk: If you recall, we were trying to get this done so that we could discuss it for the 2007 budget. I agree with what Darren is saying that by the time we get the information and everything then in May and June we start the 2008 budget discussions. That is what he is saying to put this into place, it will be the 2008. I agree that I don't foresee us making any changes during 2007. I will recall that we discussed the salary for the coming year and I was the one that made a motion for 2.5% and it was voted down.

Paula Hughes: I would echo Councilman Miller's comments about this being made in a vacuum because we are not in the thick of the discussion. I go beyond your concerns because I believe that one of the most important things

we can do for county employees is to rectify the inequities in the system and to adjust the salaries. We need to make sure that we have the funds to do so. I supported a 2% increase because there are some positions that are at market. An across the board blanket raise moves everybody up. Redlining is a less painful way of moving people backwards. I think it will widen the divide because it is not targeting the areas that need addressing. I don't know that I am supportive of this. I think it is crucial that we do the reclassification project and that we have the funds available to do that.

James Ball: I would like to re-address the motion that can cover these and accomplish a good mix. I make a motion to allocate a 1%, one-time, bonus realizing that we do have the \$1 million dollars that we collected.

Tera Klutz: Plus the \$1 million in the budget.

Lisa Blosser: That you set aside.

Patt Kite: I was going to ask. Didn't Council set some aside?

Paula Hughes: We set \$1 million aside for what is a \$4 to \$5 million project.

Patt Kite: Exactly.

Paula Hughes: And we have no way of knowing.

Cal Miller: I would go back to the same point that I made before. We owe the taxpayers a thorough and fair analysis as to if this is an appropriate expenditure after the prioritization of the County's overall needs. This forum, as a throw in at the end of the meeting, is not equipped to undertake what each of us was elected to do.

James Ball: I think we also need to balance that to sending a message to the employees of the county that we do respect and recognize their work and that we have put them on hold. I think it sends a nice message that we recognize what you do.

Cal Miller: It may be a nice message but that is not what we were elected to do. We were elected to look at the big picture, make decisions about prioritization and when I said I don't support this today, I also said that I would be happy to sit here and work this out today or come back next week and work it out. But I am not going to do it without having all of the numbers and equations back on the table. It is just not what we were elected to do.

James Ball: When you say thoughts and equations, can you tell me what you mean?

Cal Miller: Everything. What are our priorities? Let's go back and talk about everything that we talked about when we decided to give the two percent. What are our priorities, how much do we want to have in the Rainy Day Fund and what other needs do we have? That whole analysis that we undertook is not present here.

Paula Hughes: Councilman Moss?

Paul Moss: There are lots of ways to show respect to employees and there are probably good examples on this floor of ways of doing that. I don't buy into the fact that the only way to show respect and appreciation to employees is to give them one percent bonus or something along that line. I am really uncomfortable now with doing this, for a variety of reasons, some of which Councilman Miller brought up. From a larger perspective, I think I have been the one that has probably indicated some uneasiness about arbitrary raises. One of the reasons is the Oliver system was put in place and the step system under the assumption that it would adequately pay employees and would provide raises within that step system to maybe not keep up with the market but to at least provide raises. My point is, if we are going to continue to throw money at this, for whatever reason, then it throws into question the Oliver system. I am happy to move away from that. I do get a little frustrated when people act like there have been no raises because there have been raises.

Paula Hughes: Councilman Vogt?

Darren Vogt: If you recall that in 2000 there was a 10% increase and in the conversations I have had with Mr. Temple and the Oliver system and with the Oliver system, once the grid is in place, it is good for approximately three years. The step system is not part of the Oliver system. In the Oliver system, the pay is to be set for three years and re-evaluated. The reason you saw the jump for the 10% is because it hadn't been evaluated for a good number of years, in fact since it was implemented in the 1990's. I agree that we need to come up with some sort of dollar or percentage and not just us coming up here and pulling a percentage out of the air. We need to tie something to some sort of index. We obviously don't have the inflation that some of the coastal areas have but we need to move forward with some systematic way to do that. I am frustrated that we haven't gotten that far and it is a challenge. Councilman Miller, if you are willing to roll up your sleeves and look at that analysis at our January meeting, I would be willing to do that. We can look at that conversation again and move forward at that time. I would be willing to hold off until then. We don't move at a pace that we would like to move at

and that is because of the nature of the beast. The only way I would like to do that is if we would have the full analysis. It was not my intention to do this willy-nilly or haphazard. It was to have a good discussion like we are having. You are right that we don't have the financial numbers in front of us and the overall analysis to look at it. That would be my suggestion.

Roy Buskirk: To add to the pot, I would support that we need to look at the numbers again, but we do have to support our employees. I have a lot of empathy for the ones on the bottom of the wage scale. I would suggest, just throwing this out, those making \$30,000 or less, getting a 1% bonus. This is partly in fact of the \$1 million dollars that was collected. It would be a one-time bonus and not a raise or anything.

Cal Miller: Is this a motion or something you want to consider if this Council reconvenes in early January to look at the big picture?

Roy Buskirk: I will make it a motion.

Cal Miller: For the same reasons I have stated before, I do not believe it is appropriate to do this at the end of the meeting at the end of the year. I don't think we should play Santa Claus with the taxpayers' money. I am willing to take the appropriate steps to see if there is an appropriate way to make sense to increase pay for 2007.

Paul Moss: I would agree with that and we now have motion number four that may or may not die of a second, which in my mind, pretty much solidifies the fact that we need to regroup and talk this through.

Darren Vogt: I will make another motion that we table this discussion until the January full Council meeting.

Roy Buskirk: I will second that.

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second, is there any further discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion to table this discussion until the January 18, 2007 meeting has passed 7-0. Any other business, to come before the Council? Miller then Buskirk.

Cal Miller: I wanted to say thank you very much to Councilman Ball. It has been a pleasure and an honor to get to know you in a short period of time. Your insight and ability to climb the learning curve was impressive. It has been an honor to serve with you for the short period of time and I wish you and your family all the best going forward.

James Ball: Thank you.

Darren Vogt: Second that.

Roy Buskirk: Second that.

Patt Kite: I second that.

Cal Miller: And secondly, I would like to thank Councilwoman Hughes for doing an extraordinary job this year as President. There was no doubt that when I cast my vote for her she would be an able leader to take us through 2006. Thank you very much.

Paula Hughes: Thank you.

Darren Vogt: Make a motion to waive the second reading of any matter approved today for which it may be deemed necessary for the County Council meeting of December 21, 2006.

Patt Kite: Second.

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second, is there any further discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion has passed 7-0.

Roy Buskirk: One item to bring to everybody's attention and that we need to look at is that I am working with the Highway Department and Dan Avery (NIRRC) as far as getting some funding. With the Fort to Port road project, there is going to be additional expenditures on behalf of the county. To give an example, Harper Road is going to be a cul-de-sac. That is the main road that comes out there at the 469 off-ramp. Any traffic coming out there would be moved down about half a mile to the east and using Doyle Road. Doyle Road is a gravel road. So obviously, the County is going to have some expenditures on upgrading Doyle Road. There are other roads that are going to be closed between the Ohio line and 469. That will funnel more traffic onto other county roads. They will have to be upgraded and approved. Last week, at the public hearing at Woodburn, I talked to some of the INDOT staff and asked if there were going to be additional funds for the county because of the additional expenses and it was like "We will do our typical job and improve the county road 150 to 200 feet out on each side." The county is going to have to see if there is 80% federal funding available. But even if that is available, the county is going to have to pick up 20%. I just wanted to make everyone aware of that. At the present design, they are eliminating any interchanges.

They are all going to be at grade, even the 101 and 24. This is something that concerns me very much and we have until January 12th to voice our opinions. At the January 4th meeting, I will bring information. The at grade interchange, especially with the Amish we have in that area, I think is inappropriate.

Cal Miller: Motion to adjourn.

Darren Vogt: Second.

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second, is there any further discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion has passed 7-0.

The next meeting will be held on January 18, 2007 at 8:30 am.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 11:02 am.